

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,516	09/04/2003	Michael V. Paukshto	A-72209/AJT/TJH	8033
32940 7	590 01/11/2005		EXAM	INER
DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 4 EMBARCADERO CENTER			WANG, GEORGE Y	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 3400	SUITE 3400			
SAN FRANCI	SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111		DATE MAILED: 01/11/2009	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		AL				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Antique Comments	10/656,516	PAUKSHTO, MICHAEL V.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	George Y. Wang	2871				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REITHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of third iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	v					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	his action is non-final.					
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the applicating 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with the state of the above claim(s) is/are allowed. 5) ☐ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and state of the application a	drawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam 10)☑ The drawing(s) filed on 04 September 2003 Applicant may not request that any objection to t Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corn 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ the drawing(s) be held in abeyar rection is required if the drawing	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a line.	ents have been received. ents have been received in A riority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage				
See the attached detailed Office action for a l	ist of the certified copies not	received.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date		formal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verrall et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,099,758, hereinafter "Verrall") in view of Mortazavi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,667,719, hereinafter "Mortazavi"), and in further view of Trapani et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0002154, hereinafter "Trapani").
- 3. As to claims 1-3 and 5, Verrall discloses a liquid crystal display device (fig. 1, ref. 10) comprising a front panel (fig. 1, ref. 18) and a rear panel (fig. 1, ref. 15) and a liquid crystal layer placed between the panels (fig. 1, ref. 16), where the front panel comprises an internal polarizer (fig. 1, ref. 17).

However, the reference fails to specifically disclose an internal polarizer between an electrode and where the polarizer is made of a material chemically stable at an elevated temperature of at least 150 °C.

Trapani discloses polarizers for use in LCDs situated above an electrode (pg. 1, [0002]).

Application/Control Number: 10/656,516

Art Unit: 2871

Mortazavi discloses a polarizer for use in LCDs made of an optically anisotropic dichroic crystal film comprising a rodlike supramolecules (col. 2, lines 66-67) formed from a lyotropic LC containing at least on dichroic dye (col. 4, lines 1-9) that is chemically stable at an elevated temperature of at least 150 °C (col. 4, lines 19-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have an internal polarizer between an electrode and where the polarizer is made of a material chemically stable at an elevated temperature of at least 150 °C since one would be motivated to provide high polarizing efficiency with good transmission (Mortazavi, col. 3, lines 1-5) in displays for optimized contrast control (col. 1, lines 15-16) under elevated temperature and humidity situations (col. 4, lines 56-67).

- 4. Regarding claims 4, 6-8, and 10-12, Verrall discloses the LCD device as recited above where the thickness of the internal polarizer is less than 1 micron (col. 4, lines 11-12) and further comprising an external polarizer (fig. 1, ref. 14) on the other panel, a reflecting layer (fig.1, ref. 13) on the rear panel that is diffusive and specular, and a backlighting system (fig. 1, ref. 11, 12).
- 5. <u>As per claim 9, Verrall discloses the LCD device as recited above, however, the reference fails to specifically discloses front lighting system.</u>

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included a front lighting system since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in

the art. St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8. Furthermore, it front lighting systems are well known in the art to provide illumination in reflective-type displays.

Page 4

- 6. <u>As per claims 13-17</u>, Verrall discloses the LCD device as recited above having at least on external polarizer (fig. 1, ref. 19) on the same panel as the internal polarizer (fig. 1, ref. 17), a backlighting system (fig. 1, ref. 11, 12) on the rear panel, and where the polarizers perform a function of filtering light (fig. 1, ref. 14).
- 7. Regarding claim 18, Verrall discloses the LCD device as recited above, however, the reference fails to specifically teach an antireflection or an antiglare coating.

Trapani discloses a polarizer with functional layers that include an antireflection or an antiglare coating (abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included an antireflection or an antiglare coating since one would be motivated to eliminate the need for protective cladding an support structures of the polarizer and to maintain a relatively thinner and lighter profile (pg. 3, [0027]). This ultimately improves the brightness and maximized performance for the display over a wide range of transmission levels (pg. 3, [0027]).

8. As to claims 19-23, Verrall discloses the LCD device as recited above where the thicknes and the order of functional layers are selected to ensure an interference

Art Unit: 2871

extremum at the display output for at least one wavelength in the spectral range from 500 to 600 nm (col. 8, lines 18-24).

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Y. Wang whose telephone number is 571-272-2304. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H. Kim can be reached on 571-272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

gw January 10, 2005 RCORNIL H. KIM SUPERVISORY FATERT EXAMMER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2000